

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-18 and 32-33 are pending in the application. Claims 32-33 are new.

The withdrawal of the earlier rejection of claims 1-18 is noted with appreciation. The claims now stand rejected under § 103 over Jansen (6,243,450) in view of Jacobson (6,488,205).

Jansen discloses a kiosk terminal that can be used by the public, e.g., to access the internet. The kiosk usually operates on a “pay-per-use” basis, e.g., by charging a user’s credit card. However, some services – such as on-line maps or guidebooks, may be provided free of charge.

The Jansen specification also notes “Other services, known as loyalty programs, may be provided free-of-charge to identified customers of the service providers” (col. 1, lines 54-58). However, the specification does not seem to elaborate further on this point.

One exemplary embodiment encompassed within the scope of applicants’ claim 1 is a Volvo car advertisement printed in a magazine, and a kiosk sponsored by Volvo’s parent: Ford. This advertisement (the “object”) is presented to an optical sensor (e.g., a web cam). Data from this optical sensor is processed to yield an object identifier (e.g., A93FB, which serves as an identifier of the Volvo car ad).

The claim then requires “consulting a data structure to identify a web address corresponding to said object identifier.” In the Volvo car ad case, a database may be consulted to determine a particular web page (e.g., <http://www.volvo.com/group/global/en-gb/xc70.htm>) corresponding to the object identifier (A93FB).

The claim then requires “consulting a data structure to determine whether said web address is among those sponsored by a third party.” This data structure can be a database indicating, for example, that all web pages in the ford.com, jaguar.com and volvo.com root domains can be accessed by users without charge.

The concluding clause of claim 1 requires that certain costs associated with this (free-to-the-user) linking be charged to the third party (e.g., Ford).

It will be recognized that Jansen and Jacobson do not teach or suggest certain of these features.

For example, in the arrangement of claim 1, the web page being linked is identified by reference to the object identifier, *i.e.*, it corresponds to the presented object (e.g., the Volvo ad). Jansen does not teach such an arrangement. The web page he views is not determined by reference to the credit card he presents.

Moreover, while Jansen suggests identifying customers of the service provider, and providing them certain unspecified services for free (col. 1, lines 56-58), he does not teach allowing such customers to freely browse some web pages, but not others – as specified by the claim.

Similarly in claim 5 – the claim language requires that the particular computer address to be viewed is determined by reference to data produced by the sensor. Jansen does not determine the web page to be viewed by reference to the credit card presented thereto.

New claim 32 requires checking whether the desired web page is in a class of web pages for which the device permits free viewing. This checking includes checking a root domain of the desired web page against a data structure having a catalog of root domains.

Jacobsen is not understood to cure the foregoing deficiencies.

Accordingly, even if the references were combined, the combinations defined by the pending claims could not result.

The foregoing discussion is believed to show that *prima facie* obviousness has not been demonstrated. Accordingly, applicants do not belabor this response by further remarks on the rejections, the claims, and the art.

Favorable reconsideration and passage to issuance are solicited.

Date: November 8, 2005

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By


William Y. Conwell
Registration No. 31,943